

Morton N. Y. Jan. 2/1925

Rev. Stewart M. Robinson.
W. M. A. K. Lockport - N. Y.

Dear Sir:-

I wish to tell ^{you} how
much we enjoyed your
lovely sermon over the
Radio Dec. 21 and Dec. 28th
also a very enjoyable concert
music. We certainly
enjoyed and appreciated
it very much. Now thanking
you and ^{all} participants for
such a great pleasure
I wish you a Happy and
Prosperous New Year.

Yours very Respectfully,

Mr. Chas. A. Skutt.

Morton Orleans Co. N. Y.

6 Chestnut Park Road
Toronto, Canada.
Sunday, Jan. 14th, '25.

Rev. Stuart M. Robinson,
Lockport,
N.Y.

Dear Sir,
Have just enjoyed your ^{very} fine
sermon - and service which came in
here with special clarity and volume
and no interference.

My brother and ~~was~~ ^I were delighted with
your correct and beautiful views and
exposition of the true Christianity.

We hope to have more of your ser-
mons in the future from WMAK.

Enclosed you will find a small
contribution towards the broadcasting
expenses.

Yours sincerely,

Arthur E. Hazarty.

Jonestown Jan. 4th.
1925.

Rev. S. M. Robinson
Litchport N.Y.

Dear Sir. Sunday morn-
-ing we heard your exalta-
-t^{ion} sermon for the 1st-
time. The sermon ought-
to be a great-help to
Christians against-
modernism. Your voice
came in so clear, we enjoyed
it immensely. I remain

Respectfully yours

A. E. Hanna
P. O. No. 2, Jonestown
Guyana

Wetham
Coly

Warsaw N.Y. R-5 Jan 4. 1925

Rer Stewart M. Robinson

Lockport - N.Y.

Dear Bro. We had the pleasure of hearing every word of the sermon rendered by you at eleven o'clock today, which we enjoyed very much. Thanks. We consist of a family of five. father mother two daughters & son.

Our daughter teaches in Hornell. The youngest is in Warsaw. High. & The son runs the farm. I have a mill & repair shop. We are seven miles from Warsaw. out in the country we are all members of the U B Church of Quakerstown. our services are at 2:30 P.M. we have had our radio only four weeks. & happened to get your sermon the first time you broad casted. two weeks ago. Hoping we may hear many more of your sermons.

Very Truly Yours Bro in Christ
H. E. Griffen.

BURT, N. Y.,

Jan 5 1925

Rev. Stewart M. Robinson

Lockport N.Y.

My Dear Sir,

Yesterday in company with some neighbors I had the privilege of listening to a sermon broadcasted by you from the First Presbyterian Church of Lockport.

We were delighted with the clean-cut way in which you laid bare the falsity and cowardice of the so called "Modernist" movement, and with your stalwart defense of, "The faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints"

However there was one statement which you twice repeated during your service, which my neighbor, a man of intelligence but who makes no profession, questioned. And frankly, I will say I

BURT, N. Y., 192

Can find no scriptural authority for it

The statement in question is this,
that God had hallowed and blessed
the day on which you were worship-
ping. What foundation of fact
have you for the assertion? I Thes. 5. 21,
I Pet 3. 15.

Hoping you may favor us with
a reply and wishing Gods blessing
on your good sword, I am,

Yours for the Old Book,

John D. Lindsay.

WILSON N Y JAN-5-25.

REVEREND STEWART M ROBINSON.

LOCKPORT. N.Y.

DEAR SIR:

I LISTENED TO YOUR EXCELLENT SERMON OVER THE RADIO YESTERDAY.
IT IS MY DUTY TO SECURE THE SPEAKERS FOR THE WILSON MENS CLUB.
I EXTEND AN INVITATION TO YOU TO BE OUR SPEAKER ON MARCH 6-25 AT 8 P M.
AT OUR CLUB ROOM AT THE CHURCH PARLOR OF THE WILSON PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.
PLEASE ADVISE BY MAIL IF YOU CAN ACCEPT.

YOURS.

C.S.TAGGART.



C. C. BLYTHE & SONS
PERRY, NEW YORK

Jany. 5, 1925.

Rev. Stewart M. Robinson,
Lockport, N.Y.

My dear Sir:-

The writer has been deprived of attending church service for the past two sundays on account of staying in with an aged father-in-law who has had a shock and is confined to his chair.

We have both been greatly edified and helped by listening in over the radio to your morning service.

I wish to heartily commend you for your stand against the so called modernists, and trust and believe God will greatly bless you in proclaiming the good old fashioned gospel of the "Son of God" in all its simplicity and power, which is so much needed at the present time.

Again expressing our appreciation and delight of listening in to your sermons, I am

Yours sincerely,

C. C. Blythe.

East Aurora Jan. 6 25

Rev. Stuart Robison
First Presbyterian Church
Lockport N.Y.

Dear Sir:

Please find enclosed one Dollar
toward the radio fund, and very
very much obliged for listening
in. Our set is a Christmas present
from the Children, and how
we do enjoy it just please let
me put it down as it comes
from the heart. Blessed be God
for the wonderfull invention of
the Radio and God bless you
dear christian brother for the
pure Messages you are sending
through it for they are a living
digestible and nourishing food for

A hungry Soul. Your Congregation
is to be congratulated to be con-
nected to a true life, where, of the
Gospel. And I can't help but
feel that your sermons are a
blessing not only to those who
sit before you, but also to
those who are listening in.
May Our beloved Redeemer
Christ Jesus reward you richly
and give you an abundance
of strength to withstand those
who are not ashamed of, to
defile the sacred Word of God.
And blessed be God for our five
Children and may God bless them
to stand firm in the Gospel
truth for the other things will
take care of itself. So I'll beg
you to remember them in your
prayer

They are so far good Children
but they are coming to the age
were. The environment of the
world looks better to them, as
the well fare of body and soul.
So when you will step into
your pulpit again you can
rest assured we are listening,
for I know that Our dear
heavenly Father will bless
us all

Respectfully Yours
F. Herman Schmidt
R. F. L. East Aurora
Route 3 N. Y.
Box 80

1318 Kenmore Ave
Buffalo N.Y.
Jan 6 1925

Rev. Stewart Robinson
Lockport N.Y.

Dear Sir, I wish to thank you
in behalf of my aged Mother-in-law
for the wonderful sermon delivered
by radio last Sunday. She is
84 years old and a shut-in and
has been denied the privilege of
church service for five years.

We feel that with
defenders of the faith such as
you behind the microphone,
radio may be a real blessing
to the world. Too many "preachers"
these days are anxious only to

However I hope that
these services continue and
perhaps in the future may
come a day when I myself
shall be compelled to remain
at home and then I shall
avail myself of the opportu-
nity of hearing you.

Again I wish to thank
you and the station also
which makes this service
possible.

Sincerely yours

Harris C Harvey

P.S. Would it be possible for us to see a copy
of this most excellent inspiring & helpful
book like to see it published in the Christian Home.

Ms. H. C. H.

tickle the ears of the listeners-in
with their man made religion, and
lull their consciences to sleep with
philosophical morphine.

I am glad it happened on
to W.M.A.K.'s test program Saturday
afternoon and learned of this
service, and I think it deserves
a place among the programs in
the Buffalo Evening News.

The telling of the Church
bill was an unusually realistic
part of the service.

I am sorry that I did
not hear your sermon but
being a Baptist and Supt of
the local Sunday School I could
only tune in and run away

MYSTIC SIDE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH
WEST EVERETT, MASSACHUSETTS

REV. CHARLES E. DUNN, MINISTER
~~28 BRACKENBURY STREET~~
MALDEN, MASSACHUSETTS

28 Wigglesworth St.

8th January, 1925

Dear Stew-

Two weeks ago I was working in the Congregational Library, and picked up the last number of the Princeton Theological Review. I read a good deal of it with interest, including your well written review of "Why I Believe in Religion?", by Dean Brown. There were certain points raised in your review which interested me a good bit, and I thought I would write you briefly, about them.

First, as to the Person of Christ. I have strong conservative leanings in me, and I have deep respect for the conservative wing in theology, but I have never been able to make out just why the conservatives hold so tenaciously as they do to the phrase which you use "Jesus Christ is God." There is, of course, an historic precedent for such a phrase, notably in the Nicene Creed. But the phrase seems to me to be erroneous, if we use the New Testament sources as a basis for our thought. Nowhere is it directly stated in the New Testament that Jesus is God. The nearest approach to this position is in the Fourth Gospel conception of the "Logos." According to this, the pre-existent Jesus, or Word, was God. This is quite different from saying that Jesus Christ, in the flesh, was God. It is clear that the Johannine author made a very clear distinction, and separation in person, between Jesus in the flesh, and God the Father, who is called "creator." You don't write like me, but I am convinced that, in this matter of the Person of our Lord, the liberal position is the correct and soundest, both historically, and philosophically. The out and out identification of Jesus with God results in hopeless confusion. He is the revelation, the manifestation of God. He is the Son, through whom alone we obtain access to God. But He is not God Himself. Paul's phrase "God was in Christ"; and the great text in John, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father", express to me the heart of the truth in this matter of the doctrine of the Person of Jesus.

Now as to the Bible itself. You evidently don't like

MYSTIC SIDE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

WEST EVERETT, MASSACHUSETTS

REV. CHARLES E. DUNN, MINISTER

2)

~~55-BRACKENBURY STREET~~
MALDEN, MASSACHUSETTS

Dean Brown's liberal position on this point. Here again I should like to plead for the sanity of the liberal position. I do not deny that there is historic precedent for the theory of plenary inspiration. But I submit that this legalistic, mechanical doctrine was not held by Jesus, by Paul, nor by Luther at his best. Nor do I believe it to be really held ^{in their hearts,} by devout people who do hold it in their heads. We all discriminate. We try to "rightly divide" the word of truth. That means that some of it means much to us, and some little, that there are sublime heights in the Bible, and low depths. We rate the gospels as ahead of Ecclesiastes, and we certainly have discarded a vast bulk of the old legislation. No one, for instance, considers it a sin any more to loan money at interest. The guiding principle in all this choice is the Spirit of God within us. Of course men take extreme positions. This can't be helped altogether. A certain few are always bound to carry any position to an extreme. But the liberal position on the Bible, as held by the rank and file of the liberals, is thoroughly sound, and thoroughly evangelical.

As to the Atonement. You are perhaps right in a good deal of what you say. I haven't read Dean Brown's book, so I am not in a position to judge the merits of the controversy. The old position has the advantage of being absolutely clear, and thoroughly logical. But it has the defects of its qualities. It is too cold, too rigid, too penal, and certainly comes out of an age when the conception of law was far less humanistic and democratic and Christian than it is today. Vague as it is, and groping and uncertain, in comparison with the old hard and fast dogmatism, the liberal position, I think, is closer to life, in its doctrine of the Cross. Here again we won't agree. But you may be perfectly sure that the liberals, on the whole, put the Cross in the center of their Christian thinking. They are loyal to it, even though they may have to plead guilty to heresy.

MYSTIC SIDE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH
WEST EVERETT, MASSACHUSETTS

REV. CHARLES E. DUNN, MINISTER
55 BRACKENBURY STREET
MALDEN, MASSACHUSETTS

3)

I write in an irenic spirit. Can't something be done to heal the serious breach in Christian circles today? The attitude of the Princeton Review is not reassuring. Its writers all seem in a most worried state of mind. They have their ammunition out in full battle array, and they are eager to pour terrifying broadsides into the breast of anyone who dares to take issue with the Princeton theology. Well, why be so scared? Why look upon truth as deposited in the heads of a restricted group? We can hold to our views tenaciously, and, at the same time, recognize that a different school of thought is equally sincere and able, and equally devoted to the truth which is the goal of us all, no matter what tag is sewed upon us.

Sometimes I think that the salt of humour would help a lot. "A bit of humour", wrote J.H. Jowett, to his daughter, "is a good safeguard against a too narrow and bitter theology." Take this appalling unedifying scrap that Machen is waging against Fosdick. I know Machen well, and recognize him to be a New Testament scholar of the first rank. But his statements about Fosdick are simply ridiculous. I am one of Fosdick's old students, and can speak with authority in this matter. And the trouble seems to be that Machen has no sense of humour whatever. He is all cold, hard logic. Christianity, to him, consists of a series of propositions. Accept these, and you are a Christian. Henry vanDyke said that Machen's gospel was "bilious." This is too strong, and I don't defend Henry's action in leaving the First Church. But I do think that Machen ought to take a few lessons from Charles Erdman in the gospel of the seediness of life.

Well, I didn't mean to write so long an epistle. I wish we could see one another. I doubt if I get back to the tenth reunion. I have been almost four years in Malden, and have had a very busy, interesting time here. I am now married, and have a home of my own.

Keep on writing more reviews, and you may be sure of a sympathetic reading from me. Best of luck to you always, and to the Presbyterian Church, the rock in which I was hewn.

Charles E. Dunn

January 9, 1925.

Dear Soc.,-

Well, it took a review in the Princeton Review to pull a good letter from my old friend! I did not know anybody read that magazine, especially in New England. Probably they store it in the department of paleontology. Well, maybe so, but old Princeton has a pretty long and fine record and I suspect has done more for the glory of God and the extension of the Gospel than New England Unitarianism with all its high-brows. You know they say of the Unitarians that they only sent one missionary to China, and he turned Buddhist, evidently finding that a much warmer and vital faith than Unitarianism.

I will try to answer your questions, if you will answer just one for me, namely, wherein does this that we call Modernism or Liberalism differ from Unitarianism? If you will point out to me the real and vital differences, I will be edified. I have a statement of the Unitarian Creed as given by Chas. W. Eliot in an address at Symphony Hall Feb. 4, 1917, and for the life of me it reads to me, just like this precious Modernism.

(1) The Person of Christ. You follow Dr. Fosdick in whose latest book he calls attention to the 'heresy' of the conservative in calling Jesus God. Jesus was God and man. That is undoubtedly the correct and complete statement. But either half is also true, though not the whole truth. To say "Jesus is God" means to me to say concretely and roundly that Jesus is Deity, or Divine. He said, if I remember correctly, in one place, "I and my Father are one". "Before Abraham was, I am."

(2)

When John says the Word was God, perhaps he meant what Jesus meant when He said "before Abraham was, I am." I do not believe you can take any single verse and make it the "heart of the truth in this matter of the doctrine of the Person of Christ". Historic Trinitarianism has very adequately weighed and allowed for the whole expression of the Scriptures taken together. And I am afraid in historic Christianity you will not find ground for your sentence, "He is not God Himself." He is the Son, but the Son is God, the Father is God, the Holy Spirit is God. Jesus is the Son of God, Jesus is God.

(2) As to the Bible. It seems to me that you mistake and confuse revelation with inspiration. There is "historic precedent for the doctrine of plenary inspiration" as you say. The precedent begins in the Old Testament and runs right on down to and including this twentieth century in which you are living. I do not believe in a "legalistic, mechanical doctrine". I do not try to make the Book say things, it does not say. I do not believe it teaches or ever taught that the earth is flat. I do not believe that it teaches or ever taught that the world was made in the six days of a week. "Day" means period of time. Read Basil King, he is no conservative: The Bible and Common Sense.

Here is where you go wrong. The Bible is a very uneven revelation. There is more vital revelation on a page of the Gospels, say than in a chapter of Chronicles, that is more that you and I ought to know, but that fact of the quantitative amount of revelation-content, is a vastly different thing from the authenticity, validity, and truth of those parts which may carry less revelation but be equally inspired and equally true. Many bees return to the hive, some bulge with honey, some have only a little, but it is all honey.

(3)

"Hast thou found honey? eat so much as is sufficient for thee, lest thou be filled therewith and vomit it." Proverbs 25:16 The Holy Spirit does take of the things of God and show them unto us. But the modernist has to be careful that the Spirit of God is not his own spirit. The Spirit cannot lie, what was given by inspiration to men of old time hasn't ever been repealed or apologized for by the Holy Spirit since. Things do not run in heaven the way they do in the Academies of this earth, where the "final dictum of learning" one day is rubbish the next week. But you, again, have to take the whole Bible and study it together. One part depends on another and the fuller light throws beams back into the deeper shadows of the distant past. "Rightly divide" by all means, but don't throw parts away.

As to the Atonement. There is only one test that can logically be applied to this, do we teach the Scriptural doctrine. The old position which you say "is absolutely clear" is clear to my way of thinking just and only because it is faithful to the New Testament and Bible at large. I want a doctrine of the Atonement which is true to God first, then I feel sure that it will be close enough to life. God has been dealing with mankind far longer than modern theology. The Bible at the very least represents a larger view than the best sight in this one century. The doctrine of the Atonement I want to hold is the Biblical doctrine. I have no reverence for any theory, qua theory. Throw away all the theologies and histories of dogma, I say, and just take your Bible, and explain to me the death of Christ.

The liberals do try to put the Cross into the center of their Christian thinking as you say, but they are vague and groping as you also say, and for this simple reason: they do not just understand why the Cross has to be at the center of their thinking. It looks to the average liberal like a rather enigmatical thing that Jesus Christ evidently took human sin so seriously, because the modern liberal has eliminated sin from his thinking. The old Bible doctrine of the Atonement looks to the liberal like a battering ram drawn up against a summer cottage. The idea that the Son of God should become incarnate, live and die on the cross, and rise again and intercede through all time for men because they are sinners, otherwise doomed to eternal death is too big for the modernist's idea of sin. Human sin as he sees it does not demand all that commotion.

There, to my mind, is the point of it all. Liberalism is dilutant. A college friend who is a liberal minister and I went to a retreat of Presbyterian ministers, all of whom were liberals. They spent an afternoon and evening trying to discuss the great issues in the ministry, pastoral evangelism, personal work etc. At ten o'clock that night this fellow and I went to our room, which we shared. My friend said, Stew has it struck you that not once this day, did any one of those men mention sin. Now he was a liberal, but he began to realize that liberalism is missing the mark. It is out after the head and not the heart.

Liberalism historically is a sterile force. Study your church history and find where any lasting good has come from Arianism, Semi-Arianism, Socinianism and all the rest of it. For it has manifested itself in every age.

After forty years with it William Ellery Channing is reported to have said, "I wish I could ~~let~~ the future of Unitarianism with more hope." Liberalism can no more bring new born souls into the kingdom of God than you can be descended from a long line of maiden aunts.

Secondly liberalism is a class religion. It does not seem to appeal to mankind, but bias for the fleeting favor of the "cultured". Its success is with that stunted class who have been raised full of agnosticism in college and whom liberalism "wins" by converting their skepticism and rendering it faith. It goes over to them and then calls them won to religion.

Lastly and lastly, it has no message for the stricken sinner. You can not go to a liberal in the parlor, the study, the sumptuous banquet room, the college commons, but you find no liberals among the grief stricken sin laden staggering humanity who are without God and without hope in the world. There is no liberal evangelism.

Recently we have been broadcasting our services, and the one outstanding thing which has impressed me has been the hearty expressions which have come in by mail commending my conservative stand for historic Christianity. And this is a very liberal neck of the woods.

You said a good deal when you said you had conservative leanings and were hewn from the rock of Presbyterianism. That is what is holding the liberal cause afloat. Ninety percent. of the liberals were originally orthodox believers. I am believer enough in the perseverance of the saints to think that many of you will come through all right in the end. From the days of Paul in Athens the Grove and the Academy have always been cold to

(6)

the Gospel. They laughed at Paul and they will not take you and me seriously. Recently through a generation there has been a mighty tide of youth pouring through the groves and the academies and they have come out saturated with the tentative skepticism which always prevails among those "who go in for culture". With a laudable zeal men like Dr. Fosdick have said, oh that we could salvage this wealth of youth. But with a terrible short-sightedness, he and others before and since his day, said, "sit down quietly and take your pill and write three-score". It was the counsel of the unjust steward. We have magnified doubt when we wanted to mitigate it.

I guess I have given you back more than you sent by weight of paper and ink. Write again. I think things will work out. Straight thinking, honest speaking and good sportsmanship ought to prevail.

With all kinds of good wishes, I am,

Your friend and classmate,

Dear Soc, -

I am sorry that so much delay comes between your letter and my answer. But writing letters of this sort must necessarily be a part of my recreation rather than a part of business, hence the gap.

Your second letter moves away from doctrines to persons. I wish you had indicated ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ in some detail the differences between the best type of Liberalism, your type and Dr. Fosdick's and Unitarianism. You say Unitarianism is one wing of Liberalism. I believe it is the more logical wing, and I am quite sure in my own mind that it is like the bottom of the toboggan slide, the place where you are bound to come to, if you let yourself go. You liberals are trying to do the impossible, namely, enjoy all the spiritual and moral blessings of orthodox Christianity and also enjoy the friendship of the world, the skeptic and the materialistic scientist. It can't be done. Christians have always had to face the music and take sides, and that demand has never been abrogated. *Original*

You could not be a follower of Jesus and a Sadducee in that day. You could not hold with Paul and the incipient Gnosticism of that age. You can't back both Celsus and Justin. All along there has been a great divide, and Christians have been called to take their stand and take the consequences.

We are being "held up" just now by "science falsely so called". There is no disagreement between science and religion. No one questions that the universe was created progressively, the Bible tells that with marvellous clearness. No one is unwilling to allow any length of time for all this to have been created. ~~and~~ But the initial creative act which made matter, (call it atom, electron or what you please), and life, and finally man was an act of God and life did not evolve from non-life and man did not evolve from an animal. He was made a man, made out an animal form, if you wish, but made specifically a man with a clear break between him and his animal background.

I was amazed to read from our old friend Conklin where he said to a large audience these remarkable things:-

1) infinite perfectibility of man is a fundamental article of faith with many people, and yet all biological evidence indicates that it is not supported by fact.

2) in bodily evolution man has made no very marked progress during the last twenty thousand years at least.

3) we must distinguish intellect and knowledge. No greater intellectual power or not so much as Greeks had, *and today.* No marked increase in cranial capacity.

more 4) within historic times the social instincts of man have not changed ~~fundamentally~~ *in these* ~~than~~ *stages* their intellectual capacities or their germ plasm.

5) of social changes: it may be questioned whether these changes are really evolutionary at all, only clothes deep, not even skin deep

In short this whole myth of man's ascent from a brute *in these* ~~ancestry~~ *stages* by gradual steps ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ is something which can only be bolstered up by dodging into an infinite past where these cultured guessers can grab a couple of million years out of their imaginations, with the vain idea that nothing times a large enough multiple will give something, which any freshman knows cannot possibly ever be true.

The history of sane and uplifting science is blessed with the names of many gloriously devout men, Bacon, Kepler, Galileo, Harvey and Newton, and a multitude lesser lights of more recent times. There is no reason for running madly after Darwin and Huxley

who dogged themselves completely so far as even the merest primary facts of religion. But these and a lot more have completely stolen the hearts of most modern savants. ~~And the worst of it is that you liberals have played into their hands.~~ And these scientists are not skeptics because they are scientists. They are skeptics because a lot of them are Jews who have always been skeptics. You will be surprised to run through the roster of modern scientists and find the number of Jews there are.

It is ridiculous to say that an intelligent man cannot be an orthodox Christian in these days. It is preposterous to say that a liberal Christian is a liberal because he is more "religious" than the orthodox Christian. There is a taint in that of something from true Christian modesty.

But, Soc, liberal Christianity does not work. You liberals are pragmatists. You test everything by how it feels to you. You abandon norms of truth, discount eternal verities, talk about definitely recorded and universally accepted facts of history as "categories of thought" which must be abandoned now. ~~And this~~ ^{now} liberalism has been tested in every Christian century and found wanting. A man McDaniel writes a book in which he mentions the contrast between Tremont Temple in Boston which he says has ever been orthodox, and King's chapel. On the same Sunday he relates 1300 people took communion at Tremont temple while 40 gathered in King's Chapel.

It was well said of Universalism which is a liberal brand of Christianity, that if it is true we don't need it, and if false we don't want it. And people get that soon enough. Witness the poor showing both Universalism and Unitarianism make as organized churches.

Liberalism can only live, like the ivy, as a parasite, on the strong trunks of sturdy orthodoxy. Hence this great drive now in orthodox denominations to get a foot-hold for liberalism or skeptical Christianity which is just what it is. Staunch, poor devout self-sacrificing orthodox Christians build up a strong church and then their rich, college bred, liberal children come along and fritter the inheritance away. But the grand-children, where, oh where are the verdant grandchildren! Safe? ^{now} in the wide wide world, with no religion, dwindling morals, depleted fortunes and cynical dispositions. They will await in that condition the moving of the Holy Spirit who will convert some of them again to Christianity pure and simple, and then they will roll up their sleeves and go back to do what their grand-parents did two ~~and~~ generations ago.

At a recent religious meeting in Harvard where several hundred were present, four men raised hands to say they had prayed that day, four, probably the same four, that they had read the Bible, while twenty five percent. asserted that they did not believe in God. Now if that is the result of liberal Christianity, for that is Harvard's boast and has been her platform these many years, I say, God save America. There are twelve million children in these United States without religious instruction of any kind. Yet they believe more, I venture, than the post-graduates at Harvard, and are less of a liability to us as a nation. But here is the point, what will the unbelieving college student do for these twelve million. Nothing.

I should like to know how you preach and what you preach? Liberal leaders say that there are large sections of the Bible which orthodox preachers are afraid of. But isn't it true that there are larger sections of the Bible which are untouched by the liberals?

What are you sure of? What do you live on spiritually yourself? Are you thoroughly sold on this preaching game? Can you see gratifying results week by week in your parish? Do you find that liberalism is preachable, and liveable, and that it wins people permanently and solidly? Does it make personal workers, generous contributors, loyal attendants at worship, prayer meeting goers, *social workers etc?*

Scotland has been a great seat of liberalism *for a generation and more* many years, except in the wee Free communion which stood out against the merger of the Free and the United Free. But reports from casual travellers going back home to Scotland, (not the professional book-writing traveller), reveal that the churches of Scotland are empty to-day. Why? Liberalism.

In the big cities an outstanding liberal can gather up a church full of his kind of people, but out in the provinces where you have to interest all classes, the liberal fellows have small audiences. A church is dying right here in Lockport on liberal preaching. Christianity is the peoples' religion, and liberalism is a "high-brow" cult.

You say, the future is the liberals'. That depends on what you mean by future. If you mean the immediate future, the conspicuous churches, the good jobs, the ecclesiastical machinery I am inclined to agree with you, although we may see some upsets in the big plan, which is being financed so generously by the Rockefeller's. But if you mean the distant future, there must be an emphatic no. The reason: because liberalism has never made good.

Soc. An old man, a middle aged man, can afford to indulge in a little heresy possibly without harm to himself, just as a mature man can smoke and drink a little for his stomach's sake, although never without great possible harm to others, particularly the young, but a young man has no business monkeying with this. You mark my words, if you stay liberal and progress with liberalism, you will not stay in the ministry, not because you will be forced out, but because you will give it up. It is all right to be abreast of the times, but it is just as well for a minister of Christ to be ahead of the times, and if you stick to your Bible you will always be plenty far ahead.

Now, your grandfather has spoken these solemn words, to thee, my son. Don't let them ruffle your feathers. You were a deep and introspective lad in college. You have picked out the best job in the world. Take a tip from me, and pull ~~hard~~ *your back* ~~hard~~ *hard* to starboard. Your "strong conservative leanings" will be a great asset, and may be an anchor for a time of storm.

Cordially your classmate and friend,

J. E. SCOTT

552 JONES AVENUE

TORONTO.....January 18st.....19.....25

Rev. Robertson
st.
1 United Pres. Church

Lockport
U.S.

Dear Sir;

As one of your unseen audience in Canada I must write and thank you for your helpful sermon that you gave on Sunday Morning.

I am greatly interested in the Book of Revelations and have been wishing to hear more about that Book than I have been priveleged to hear.

Your sermon has greatly blessed us. We are looking forward to hear you again in two weeks time D.V.

Again Thanking You

I remain Your
Brother in Christ,
John Edward Scott.

P.S.

It comes through very clearly

from A. Ronald, Minnecing.

The following verses were suggested to me on hearing the solo entitled "No Night There" at a gospel meeting which I attended when visiting California in the winter of 1913.

In the word of God we read

Of a city foursquare,
And it satisfies our need

Of a city foursquare,
For the length and breadth and height
Are the same; God is its light.
Grace and Mercy, Truth and Light
Make the city foursquare.

There is nothing that defiles

In the city foursquare,
Peace and Truth on each face smiles
In that city foursquare.

There will be no sorrow there,
Not a grief nor carking care.
We a crown of life shall wear
In that city foursquare.

All the streets are paved with gold
In that city foursquare.

And we never shall grow old
In that city foursquare.

We shall meet our friends again,
There'll be no more death nor pain,
But we shall with Jesus reign
In that city foursquare.

Would you like to have a place
In that city foursquare?

(Over)

Be a sinner saved by grace
In that city foursquare.
Jesus bids the weary come,
And the Spirit says there's room
In the Father's House and Home,
In that city foursquare.

If we come, He'll make us pure
For that city foursquare.
Our inheritance is sure
In that city foursquare.
We shall then be satisfied,
In His likeness shall abide,
Soul and body sanctified,
In that city foursquare.

Jesus died and rose for me,
From sin's curse He set me free;
This the sinner's perfect plea
Shall my right of entrance be
To the city foursquare.

Life's pure stream of water flows
In that city foursquare.
On each side the Life Tree grows
In that city foursquare.
We may drink and freely eat
Of the fruit and waters sweet,
For the Lord hath made us meet
For that city foursquare.

WILLIAM J. STANDEN,
Barrie, Ont.

Formerly of Evergreen Home,
Minesing.

July, 1920.

MINESING, ONT.,

Jan. 19 1925
(70 miles north of Toronto. Ont.)

Rev. Robinson,
C/o
Radio Station W.M.A.K.
Lockport, N.Y.

Dear Sir:-

As one of your radio audience
of yesterday, we offer our note of our
appreciation of your sermon on "Walls &
Gates". It was certainly very good and
should leave some impression on the lives
of those that heard it. We will enclose
a copy of some verses written by an
uncle of the writer which may interest
you if you can find time to read them.
They are along the line of your topic
of yesterday. As you are no doubt
a busy man we will not intrude
longer on your time.

Yours very truly,
A. Ronald.

P.S. Extend our thanks
to those interested in these broadcasts
R

CHARLES E. DUNN
28 WIGGLESWORTH STREET
MALDEN, MASSACHUSETTS

20th January, 1925

MINISTER OF THE
MYSTIC SIDE CHURCH

Dear Stew-

I was extremely interested in your letter of the ninth. There are many points raised in it provocative of discussion. Now I will not argue any further about the Person of Christ, the Bible, or the Atonement. Our agreements here are more vital than our differences. Substantially we can join hands ^{here}. It is your idea of liberalism that deserves reply. It is an idea widely held in conservative quarters, and it does a grave injustice to the liberal movement. In fact, it is something of a caricature. I am not blaming you, because the liberals err, at times, on the same score, when they describe their conservative brethren. It would help us all if we were humbler and wiser.

First, let me answer your query about Unitarianism. Unitarianism is only one wing of the liberal movement. It is utterly foolish to say that all liberals are Unitarian. As a matter of fact, you will find the widest diversity of conviction amongst the Christian liberals. Multitudes of them are Trinitarians, like myself; some accept the historic creeds con amore, and some do not; many, like the famous Professor Briggs, of Union, are conservative theologically, whilst liberal in their method of handling the Scriptures. But all are bound together in nurturing within themselves that spirit of free inquiry, which is the soul of the scientific method.

I wish you would read with care, if you haven't already done so, Fosdick's article in the current number of the Ladies' Home Journal, entitled "What Christian Liberals are Driving At." This states, with all of Fosdick's consummate skill, just what I myself hold. It's the best short statement on the subject I know, very fair, and very convincing. I don't see how you can read it, and not see that the liberal crowd is a very different group from what you now suppose them to be. Let me quote the following sentences, because they express so well just what I would like to say myself. "He is a liberal because he is more religious,

not

CHARLES E. DUNN
28 WIGGLESWORTH STREET
MALDEN, MASSACHUSETTS

MINISTER OF THE
MYSTIC SIDE CHURCH

2)

not because he is less. His growing soul, cramped in old restraints, has struck out for more air to breathe.... The best liberalism of today springs not from the diminution of Christian life but from the expansion of it..... Not one of its(Protestantism's) historic statements of faith takes into account any of the masterful ideas which constitute the framework of modern thinking-the inductive method, the new astronomy, natural law, evolution. All these have come since Protestantism arrived. The chaos and turmoil in Christian thought today spring directly from the impossible endeavor of large sections of the church to continue the presentation of the Gospel in forms of thought that are no longer real and cogent to well-instructed minds." In other words, the liberal today is waging the battle for freedom and progress. He sees how desperately Christianity, as it has come down to us in out-moded forms of thought, needs to be reformed, and he is trying courageously to do it. No doubt he makes many mistakes. Sometimes, as you suggest, in your epistle, he is in danger of mistaking his own spirit, for the Spirit of God. But his heart and his head are absolutely in the right place. He is after truth, at whatever cost, and is humbly seeking it, under the guidance of the Spirit of all truth. The present may be against him, with its misrepresentation, its persecution, its tenacity of tradition. But the future, he knows, is in his hands.

You say "Liberalism historically is a sterile force". I disagree. The best answer to that statement is the Protestant Reformation, a liberal movement. The liberal of the twentieth century is trying to do, for his own time, just what Luther and Calvin did so nobly for their time. You say "Liberalism is a class religion." This also is untrue. You will find liberals everywhere, in every class. New England is an illustration. There is just as wide a diversity of economic and cultural status here as anywhere in the country. And New England is primarily liberal in its religious thinking.

CHARLES E. DUNN
28 WIGGLESWORTH STREET
MALDEN, MASSACHUSETTS

MINISTER OF THE
MYSTIC SIDE CHURCH

3)

Then you say "There is no liberal evangelism." You are quite wrong. Look at your own Church. In my opinion, the man who has the best Presbyterian Church in the country, where the finest work is being done, is Henry Sloane Coffin, and he is a liberal leader, but thoroughly evangelical. There is also William Pierson Merrill, an outstanding liberal, whose preaching catches fire, as I know from plenty of personal experience with him. Up in New England we have plenty of fine liberal preachers who are reaching the sinners with amazing success. Let me mention only one, Henry Crane, of the Methodist Church here in Malden, who preaches, by the way, in Princeton, next month. He is, I suppose, the leading Methodist evangelist here in New England. His hold on students is wonderful. And he is a liberal to the core.

In my humble opinion, the conservatives ought to change their tactics. At present they are barricading themselves in the citadel of prescientific theology, and hurling anathemas at those who are making use of the expanding truth of the living God. Why not put a stop to this sickening quarreling? We all need each other, whatever truth we have. The Church should be inclusive enough to welcome all who love the Lord Jesus Christ. We ought, all of us, to recognize our faults, and then work together for a real, catholic faith. There is one thing certain. The orthodox cannot drive the liberals out. They are trying to do it, but they won't succeed. Better far is the strategy of fraternal love, and mutual understanding. This is the settled policy of the Congregational Churches. We have lots of very conservative men in our fellowship. They give the strength that comes from old tradition. And we have plenty of liberals, as you know, to whom religion is not a fixed deposit, but a great adventure. These give vitality, youthfulness, initiative, progress. And we all get along together, in one family, without fighting. I still have hopes that the Presbyterian Church will wake up, and act with some degree of Christlike good will.

*I have for your Calendar. You must be doing a fine piece of work. With all best wishes,
S & C*

24 Marshall St
Grafton (3)

ont. can.

Jan 23/25

Rev. S. M. Robinson

Dear Sir and Brother

R

Just a few lines

of appreciation of messages on
Sunday mornings over the radio
you preach a good Gospel
faithfully. True to your calling
in Christ Jesus our Lord.

may you be long spared to
proclaim the Gospel and have
the joy of seeing abundance of
fruit for your labor.

accept this note in the Spirit
it is written. The Spirit of our
Christ of ours in the Service
Yes Jackson